



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/662,006	09/12/2003	Hiroshi Shirai	21334-1255	8598
29450	7590	08/31/2004	EXAMINER	
BARLEY SNYDER, LLC 1000 WESTLAKES DRIVE, SUITE 275 BERWYN, PA 19312				ABRAMS, NEIL
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2839		

DATE MAILED: 08/31/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/662,006	SHIRAI ET AL. <i>AN</i>	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Neil Abrams	2839	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 July 2004.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 22-30 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Claims 22-25 and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McHugh 140 in view of Nakano, Lynch and APA.

References are applied as in last office action.

Basically obvious to provide McHugh fig. 6 with part at 102 101 formed in manner of Lynch, Fig. 5, part 73, 75 with slot 74. So formed the part could be read as a resilient contact insofar as it surrounds the slot with the part below the slot forming a base plate. For example, Lynch, fig. 5 could be read as including resilient contact at leadlines 90, 73, 72, 91 and a base plate at part 75 extending to just below bottom end of slot 74. So formed McHugh is readable on claim 22. For motivation this change enable the terminals to be more easily inserted.

Other claims treated as in last office action.

Claims 22-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakano in view of Billenstein, McHugh 140, APA, Natori and Bitsch.

For claims 22, Nakano, fig., 3, contact include base at 21, 213 and resilient part at 221, 224, to 223, but lacks a slot in the resilient part. Billenstein at FS, Figs. 2, Natori at 24, 24 use slots for easier bending and for redundant contact points, Obvious to use such feature in Nakano, fig 3 for similar reasons For claims 23, since base is broadly readable and slot is readable on end of total slot formation of slot into region between 213, 213 meets claim language. For claims 24, 26, 30 obvious to form Nakano portions at 21, 211 as flat part with barbs like 101, 102 of McHugh that of APA, fig. 7 at 101, 105 and to form tail 23 as surface mount part like 103 of Nakano or 209 of APA, fig. 9. Claim 29 met by Nakano and in addition, such feature suggested by McHugh at 106.

Claims 22, 25, 26, 29, 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Natori.

Fig. 5, note baseplate 101, 103, 81, 83, 53 with slot 71, free ends 91, 93 and board terminal 59. Obvious to locate 71 towards center of part 81, 83, 101, 103, as this would provide no unexpected result and also is suggested in fig. 1 at 24. Claim 25 reads on portion at 85, 87, claims 26, 29, 30 read on reference so applied.

Applicant's arguments filed with the amendment have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. While McHugh body 101 is not resilient the idea to so form it as a resilient part is clearly suggested by Lynch. The plate replacing 101, 102 could then be read as a base plate and resilient contact part (with slot) combined just as Lynch fig. 5 part 73, 75 are so readable. The rejections using Nakano and Natori are also applied since they are directed to the intended function of applicants invention to provide more reliable contact engagement..

Claims 1-21 are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Neil Abrams at telephone number (571)272-2089.

Abrams/ds

08/26/04


NEIL ABRAMS
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 322